

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed November 21, 2003, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, 23-25, and 27-30. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, 23-25, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier et al. (USPN 5,625,815, hereinafter "Maier") in view of Green et al. (USPN 6, 041,310, hereinafter "Green").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Maier in view of Green. Applicant respectfully points out that Maier teaches **filtering existing audit records** pertaining to an old partition such that only audit records pertaining to the old partition are received by an audit fixup process (see Maier, col. 8, lines 35-40).

In contrast, the present invention is directed to **conditionally creating audit records** based on values of fields contained within rows such that audit records do not exist unless a query meets a given set of conditions (see page 7, lines 26 to page 8, line 5 of the instant application).

Note that in the present invention, the audit condition is **based on values of fields contained within rows**. By conditionally creating audit records based on values of fields contained within rows, only transactions that access specific rows of the database containing relevant data values of interest are included in the audit trail (see page 7, lines 15-19 of the instant application).

Note that the prior art systems cannot selectively create audit records only for rows that, for example, include a salary field greater than \$100,000 (see page 7, lines 15-18 of the instant application). Hence, there is nothing within Maier or Green, either separately or in concert, which suggests conditionally creating audit records based on values of fields contained within rows such that audit records do not exist unless a query meets a given set of conditions.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention discloses and claims conditionally creating audit records based on values of fields contained within rows such that audit records do not exist unless a query meets a given set of conditions. These amendments find


support on page 7, lines 26 to page 8, line 5 of the instant application. Applicant has also amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to remove limitations that were in original claims 6, 16, and 26. These limitations have been moved to new dependent claims 31, 32, and 33, respectively. Dependent claims 7, 17, and 27 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-5, 7-10 and 31, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-15, claims 17-20 and 32, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 23-25, 27-30 and 33, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: January 14, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665